

Office—Opposite Bank, Up-Steps
Subscription
One copy, one year—\$3.00
It not paid within six months, \$2.50
No paper will be discontinued until
arrearages are paid, except at our
option.

Newspaper Patronage.
Eight long years of experience in
the publishing business, has strengthened
us in the belief that the thing
called newspaper patronage is in-
deed curious. It is composed of
as many colors as the rainbow, and
is as changeable as a chameleon.
One man subscribes for a newspa-
per and pays for it in advance; he
goes home and reads it with the
proud satisfaction that it is his own.
He hands in an advertisement, asks
the price, and pays for it. This is
newspaper patronage.
Another man says, "please put my
name on your list of subscribers,"
and goes off without as much as say-
ing pay, once. Time passes, your
paper is exhausted and you will dis-
cuss it. He flies into a passion, per-
haps pays, perhaps not.
Another man has been a subscrib-
er a long time. He becomes tired
of you and wants a change. "Think
he wants a city paper." Tells the
postmaster to discontinue, and one
of the papers is returned marked
"refused." Paying up for it is among
the last of his thoughts; besides he
wants his money to send to a city
publisher.

After a time you look over his
account and see a bill, a "balance
due." But does he pay it cheerfully?
"Please send me half dozen copies,"
and again that if you will mark off
his arrearages he will call in, in a
day or two and subscribe again.
This, too, is newspaper patronage.
Another man—your paper is too small
—don't like the editor or something
else—yet goes regularly to his neigh-
bors—reads his by a good fire—finds
fault with its contents, disputes its
positions, and quarrels with its tri-
bune. Occasionally see an article he
likes—gives him a dime or two as a
reward. This is newspaper patronage.

Another sports a fine horse, or
perhaps a pair of horses, is always
seen with whip in hand and spur on
foot—single man—no use for him to
take a newspaper, knows enough.
Finally he concludes to get married
sends a notice of the fact to the
editor, and sends him half dozen copies.
This done, does he ever pay for
notice or papers? No. "But surely,
you don't charge for such things?"
This, too, is newspaper patronage!
Another man, (bless you, it does
us good to see such men) comes in
and says "the year for which I paid
is about to expire. I want to pay
for another." He does so and re-
tires.

Reader! isn't newspaper patronage
a curious thing? And in fact, say
you when honest men get the reward
due to their honesty, which say you
of those engaged above, will ob-
tain that reward? Now it will be
seen that while certain kinds of pa-
tronage is the very life and existence
of a newspaper, there are certain
other kinds that will kill a paper
stone dead.

Consider that our good days
are generally more in number than
our evil, our days of prosperity
much more than our days of adversity.
I mean, if we are situated in our
conditions and circumstances—then
our days of adversity. This is most
certain, though most of us are apt
to cast up our accounts otherwise.
How many days—at least com-
petent health have we enjoyed? How
many days of ease to one of pain?
How many blessings to one of curse?
For, one danger that hath surprised
us, how many scores of dangers
have we escaped, but some of the
very miseries? But this we will
leave to the future, but our af-
fections are so engrained in our
memories, serve us too well to re-
member the latter, but we are too
forgetful of the former. And this
is the greatest cause of our unhappi-
ness, discontent and mourning—
Bishop Hall.

White and Black Radicals
are now engaged in applying
the lash to the backs of those who
hesitate in giving in their allegi-
ance to the new order of things.
In alluding to this fact the New
York Times says: "The white
Stevens and Butler (white men)
and Joe Cox, of Richmond, (ne-
gro man),—three well known Rad-
ical leaders—are singularly uni-
form in their views of what party
discipline requires. Stevens, lead-
ing his followers about, says, 'Let
us see the Congress vote in the
other side.' Butler says he
"would like to see anybody in the
House, or in the country, who was
on their side, vote that Andrew
Johnson was a fit man to be Pres-
ident of the United States." And
Joe Cox, of Richmond, declared:
"To all the white Radicals in this
House he would say: If you are not
where the vote is taken not
forth, or in any way do vote
duty to us, we will not vote for
you." With this worthy trio, Joe Cox,
Stevens and Butler, to drive the
white Radicals out of the pro-
cess, or if they try to look over
the fence, they will not be fault-
ed. Let the gentlemen who sit on
the box, and handle the whip and
the lash.

THE STATES AND UNION.

VOL. XXII ASHLAND, OHIO, WEDNESDAY MORNING, APRIL 8, 1868. NO. 41.

PARMELY'S COLUMN.

EXAMINE PARMELY'S COLUMN ON THE INSIDE.

SPEECH

HON. GEORGE H. PENDLETON,
Milwaukee, Wis., Nov. 24, 1867.

Mr. PENDLETON was introduced by the President, and was received with many cheers. He said:

I thank you for the friendly manner in which you have been pleased to greet me. I was told if I visited your State you would give me a cordial welcome. You have fulfilled that promise. Although I see around me those who I have ever seen before, although five hundred miles separate my home on the Beautiful River from yours on this noble lake, although some of you may possibly differ with me, to the largest degree, in political opinion, I cannot feel that we are altogether strangers.

Are we not citizens of the same country, bound up with her in a common destiny? Is not her honor our honor; her prosperity our prosperity; her glory our glory? Does not the beneficence of her government reflect on the wisdom and secure the happiness of all her people? Are we not all children of one mother, who opens wide her arms, and forgetting our follies and pardoning our crimes, enfolds us all, Democrats and Republicans alike, in her warm and loving heart? And are we not bound, each to the other by the common tie which binds us all to her. Citizens of the same country we cannot be altogether strangers, children of the same mother, in the midst of our hostile home, I can but address you except as fellow-citizens and friends.

I am oppressed by the presence in which I have traversed your State from the lake to the river; I have seen its attractive scenery, its productive fields, its exhaustless mines. I have seen its fertile soil respond with abundant harvests to the touch of the husbandman. I have seen its people contented with the abundant rewards of a fertile soil, and I stand in the midst of your city, which rises in peerless beauty from the bosom of this inland ocean, populous, rich, the center of a mighty commerce—the wheat market of the world. I meet the busy crowd which thrives through the streets, I see the spacious stores where business plies its avocations; the roomy schools where education lends its powers to the natural faculties; the handsome churches where religion seeks to soften the asperities of life; the luxurious homes where culture and refinement give a new value to wealth; the courts where justice is administered—and over all, I feel that the genius of law and social order and liberty presides, and that spirit of contentment which makes a prosperous, free and happy people.

When I see a territory—further back, when it was part of Michigan; further back, before your city was founded, when all this vast territory did not contain one citizen part of the population of your principal limits to-day. And when I recall that past, and compare with this present, I bow in reverence before the beneficence of that system of government which presents your State as an integral part of the Federal Union which rises so splendidly among its sister sovereignties of the world, and yet leaves in its hands the entire regulation of all its domestic and local affairs. Acquired from Virginia at the close of the Revolution, the Federal Government did not hold and govern this territory until 1845, and then it divided its power as owner here, proclaimed you a sovereignty, recognized your equality with those older States which had formed the Union, declared that you did possess all the rights which had been reserved, on the sole condition that you would concede the powers which had been delegated.

I will not analyze that system. I will not seek to define its form or to give it a name. Its whole foundation is that international and interstate affairs are intrusted to the Federal Government, while to the State itself is confided the care of life and liberty and property of its citizens, the maintenance of social order, the administration of justice, and the definition of that body of citizens in whom political power shall reside. Its whole organization is expressed in these two provisions: that the Constitution and all laws passed in pursuance thereof are the supreme law, and that all powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people. Its whole history shows that if secession and secession are revolution on the part of the States, usurpation of power by the Federal Government is revolution also, and equally dangerous to the peace of society and the liberties of the people. The Constitution defined the terms of union. It breathed into the Federal Government the breath of life. It prescribed the powers which should be used, and the manner of their exercise. If we seek the powers of the Federal Government, we must look to the powers delegated by the Constitution. If we seek the powers of the States, we must remember that all powers not delegated nor prohibited are reserved. There is no inherent power, "no power arising from necessity," which would be a conqueror in the Federal Government, unless it is delegated by the Constitution, for all powers not delegated are reserved.

the inquiry whether under the light of passing events, or of historical contemplation, with its formation, the Constitution might be made to bear a different interpretation from that which time has given it. The practical question is, has it proven a good Constitution and form of government for you? Have you been a prosperous, free and happy people? Has this system by which all the interests of your daily life, all the protection of your inalienable rights, all the management of your State affairs have been confided to your own care without interference from the Federal Government, worked well in your case? Has it not worked well in the case of every other State? Has it left you liberty which you know how to enjoy? Has it not imposed and enforced the obligations necessary to its existence? The Federal system, justly administered, is the strongest for defense, the weakest for aggression. Its head possesses energy and decision and power; its parts are liberty. [Great applause.]

Why then call it a weak system? Why seek by gradual aggressions upon the States to change it? Why hope to strengthen the edifice by drawing from the strength of the pillars which support it? Is it not true—I appeal to every candid man who hears me—that it is not true that every evil of Government which you have ever experienced arises from "excessive administration," to use the language of the Massachusetts Convention, and not from a vicious system? Is it not true that the growth of your unparalelled growth has arisen from perversion of our system? The passion for consolidation is at the bottom of all the trouble of the country this day. Let me illustrate it in details. The war which we weary you, but they are full of instruction.

The revenues of the Federal Government in 1866 amounted to \$561,572,260. You can hardly realize the enormous sum. When you undertake to count it, imagination almost stands aghast. It would have sufficed for the whole expense of the Administration under General Jackson for more than twenty years. The year 1866 was a year of profound peace. The army had been disbanded, the navy had been reduced, the military expeditions had not only accomplished their purpose, but they had been brought to an end. And yet in that year the Government of the United States realized from the Kingdom of Great Britain, and \$100,000,000 more than the Empire of France under Napoleon. If that amount has been assessed upon the people of the United States, it would have amounted, for every man, woman and child in the country, to more than \$11.46 in gold. And yet, in the same year the taxation of Great Britain, assessed in the same way, would have amounted to \$10.92. The taxation of France would have amounted to \$7.97, and the taxation of Austria to only \$5.27.

If that amount had been assessed upon all the taxable property, real and personal, in the United States, it would have amounted to \$3.93 upon every one hundred dollars, and if the taxation of Great Britain, in the same year, it would have amounted only to nine-tenths of one per cent. [Laughter and cheers.] The taxable property of Great Britain real and personal of every kind and description, amounts to \$36,238,800,000. The taxable property of France amounts to \$40,000,000,000, while the taxable property of the United States, of the same character, amounts to less than \$15,000,000,000. At the taxable property of Great Britain was assessed the same rate as that assessed upon France, the revenue would be more than \$12,424,000,000.

The population of Great Britain, including her colonies, amounts to 255,000,000 of people. The population of the United States amounts to less than 38,000,000 of people. The taxable property of Great Britain amounts to \$4,000,000,000, while the public debt of the United States amounts to \$3,000,000,000. I may not state the public debt at the exact amount. The Chairman of the Committee on Finance in the Senate has stated it at \$3,000,000,000. The Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House has stated it at \$4,000,000,000. I take the smaller sum. If the public debt of the United States were assessed upon every man, woman and child in the country, it would amount to \$74 a head, while the public debt of France, if assessed in like manner, would amount to \$55, that of Austria to \$45, and that of Prussia to less than \$12 a head. [Cheers.]

The interest which the United States pay for money is six per cent. in gold, and, in addition, they grant an exemption from taxation, which amounts probably to two per cent. more; while, as you all know, the interest of Great Britain is three per cent. and that of France all less. It has been stated lately, very tersely and very truly, that when the United States borrows a thousand dollars it borrows at a rate which would cost it in twenty years \$2,700, while the Government of Great Britain, going to the same market, borrows the same amount of money, on terms which will in twenty years pay to the lender \$1,700. The Government of the United States, and its territory unexampled richness, with its population unexampled in activity and energy, pays a greater rate of interest than any nation in Europe, even including Egypt and worn-out Turkey. The public debt of the United States, which I have told you was \$3,000,000,000, and has been incurred, all except \$500,000,000, within five years. The public debt of Great Britain, amounting to \$4,000,000,000, has accumulated during two hundred years.

Part of this public debt has grown out of the legitimate expenses of the war. Part of it is owing to the depreciation of the currency which arose from the issue of legal-tender notes. Of the parts of the debt thus incurred, I have nothing to present to say.

The greater part of it has grown out of the fraud and corruption and mal-administration of the party which is now in power. [Loud cheers.] I sat in Congress in 1862 to the fourth of March, 1863, when John Sherman, Chairman of the Committee of Investigation, charged with looking into the expenditures of the Government, said that the stealings on horse contracts permitted by the War Department in the first year of Mr. Lincoln's administration were more than equal to the annual expenditure of James Buchanan's administration. [Cheers.] I heard another member of Congress charged with a similar duty, declare that the Secretary of the Navy had employed a relative duty to the purchase of the navy at a commission, which in three months was equal to \$95,000. [Applause.]

I have seen it stated everywhere in the public prints, and I have never heard it denied, that the late Secretary of War paid a Republican friend of his \$500,000 for two ships which had been condemned by a board of naval officers, one of which was dismantled immediately, in order that it might be converted into a quarantine hospital. [Applause.] In 1865, after the surrender of the Confederate troops, after the war had been brought to a close, we had an Indian War in the West. I do not know whether you ever heard of it here in Wisconsin, and yet it cost you \$35,000,000. A Republican member of Congress, and a quote from his speech on your floor, says that he had occasion to investigate that subject, and he published in the Congressional Globe, the details of some of the expenditures of the war. He tells us that the death of each Indian cost the people of the United States \$2,000,000. [Laughter and cheers.] He tells us of an expedition of a valiant colonel from his own State, I believe, who, he made his report, he reported that he had lost all his horses, that he had expended all his ammunition; that he had eaten up all his provisions, and that he had killed one Indian. [Uproarious laughter and cheers.]

He was employed by the Ordnance and Express Company, whose soul was also fired with martial ardor, he came into the settlements, reported that colonel—fired—under a mistake, I suppose—for he himself had killed the colonel. [Loud laughter.] The war between this express rider and the valiant Colonel waxed warm, until some hunters in the neighborhood came to hear of it, and brought the contest to an untimely end by declaring that they knew the express rider was a villain. [Boisterous laughter and cheers.]

The Special Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who made his report to the Secretary of the Treasury in December last, declared that in the year 1866, the people of the United States and England furnished the spirit, and I have not a doubt that we consumed 100,000,000 gallons of distilled spirits. But I state it is the commissioner's report states it. You know the tax on these distilled spirits was \$2 a gallon, and that the amount of revenue ought, therefore, to have been \$200,000,000. But he tells you in fact that the sum which the Government received from that source had paid the whole amount. He tells you that in 1866, when the tax upon distilled spirits was \$2 a gallon.

He tells you that in one section of the country—a very small section—the loss which the Government sustained by the collection of revenue upon tobacco alone, was more than \$8,000,000. And yet we know that the Treasury Department employs more than 20,000 men for the purpose of administering the revenue law.

Military governments and the freedmen's bureau have been established all over the South. They cost the people of the country, by appropriations and in other ways, \$200,000,000. And what have we gained? They have secured the governments in ten States in the Union. They hold the life, and liberty, and property of the people of those States in the mailed hand of military power. They have subverted the social system; they have destroyed the supply of labor; they have turned from the pursuit of agriculture and industry to the pursuit of politics [cheers]; they have turned gardens into deserts, and by still worse threats, disturbed the repose of the people of that country and lowered industry to banishment. It is taken away, they utterly destroyed the ability of that people to pay their legitimate share of the taxation of the country. The taxation paid by the people of Cincinnati, under the internal revenue law, to day is equal to that paid by eight of the ten States of the South. [Cheers.]

The Republicans have done more. They have treated the Constitution of the United States with derision and contempt. They have destroyed all reverence for it. They have violated or amended it at the whim of the moment suggested. Thaddeus Stevens is today says, and says boastfully, that the action of the Congress of the United States, with reference to the people of the South, is outside of the Constitution; and when Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, feebly attempted to defend the Constitution, he was told that it was a "legislation without authority and reconstruction by usurpation." [Applause.]

And going further, they have utterly destroyed the Union—they have ejected ten States from it. What the ordinances of secession could not do—what the arms of the Confederates could not accomplish,

power in the government, and are ready to aid in its execution; and thus a public debt attaches the creditors to the government and chains the tax-payers to the creditors. Do we not hear, my friends, that the public debt ought not to be paid too soon; that its payment ought to be postponed as long as possible; that the bonds outstanding should be renewed as they fall due; that, as future generations will derive benefit from the interest which the debt will create, they should bear the burden of the debt? Gentlemen, I do not believe any such doctrine. I do not believe it is possible for the people of the United States, under the government which we have, to collect a revenue of \$500,000,000 every year, and yet pay the interest on the debt, and preserve the honesty, purity, and integrity which are essential to that form of government. [Cheers.]

The public debt of the United States, as I stated to you before, amounts to \$3,000,000,000. \$250,000,000 or more is a liquidated debt, and bears interest. \$800,000,000 are in greenbacks and unliquidated claims, and bears no interest. This is an enormous amount, and yet, gentlemen, I believe, and the Democratic party believes, that it should be paid every dollar of it, principle and interest, at the time it comes due, exactly in accordance with the terms of the contract under which the loans were made. Part of that debt is payable in gold and part of it is legal-tender notes. The faith of the country requires that the debt should be paid in gold, and the interest of the country requires that the other should be paid in legal-tender notes. [Cheers.] Prior to the year 1862, the laws of the United States provided that the Government should pay its debts in gold or in payment of every debt. Every debt which was contracted before that time, whether it was upon a contract, or a bond, or a note, was payable in gold, or in legal-tender notes upon the face of the contract or note.

In February, 1862, the Congress of the United States passed the legal-tender act. It provides that one hundred and fifty millions of dollars should be issued in the form of legal-tender notes, and that these legal-tender notes should be received as "lawful money." I quote the language of the act—as "lawful money, and as a legal tender in the discharge of all debts, public and private, except those of the Government and those of the public debt." Mark the language of the act, "lawful money." That is the first legal tender act. It provided for the emission of a hundred and fifty millions of dollars in paper money.

Every contract which was made at the time for the payment of money, whether by ordinary contract, or note, or bond, by whomsoever made, was made with full knowledge of the law, and was payable in these legal-tender notes, and not in gold, unless the maker chose so to discharge it. The Government, and the United States, had paid in coin every bond that was issued before the passage of that law, and which has matured since its passage; and the Government, since that time, by act of Congress, has provided for the issuing of other bonds, which, notwithstanding the legal-tender act, are to be paid in gold, and not in legal-tender notes. These are the ten-forties. They are payable in gold, principal and interest. I maintain, my fellow citizens, that every bond, except the ordinary bonds, and those issued before the legal-tender act, is payable in the greenbacks of the country. [Applause.]

The legal-tender act controls this. The law itself under which these bonds were issued provides that the principal shall be paid in gold, and the interest shall be paid in gold. Some gentlemen will say to me, as has been said, that the law which authorized the issue of these legal-tender notes provided for the first issue of the five twenty bonds did not provide that either the principal or interest should be paid in gold. I say to you, that is not the case. The law which authorized the issue of the legal-tender notes provided that the principal should not be received in payment of interest upon the public debt. Some gentlemen will say to me, as has been said before, that the law which provided for the issue of the same legal-tender notes provided that the coin to be derived from the payment of duties upon imports should be set aside and appropriated to the payment of the interest of the public debt, or to the purchase or payment, year by year, in every year, after the first day of July, 1862, of one per cent. upon the public debt. It is claimed that this provision of the law implies a contract to pay the principal in gold, or that he was utterly unable to do so, that that exactly what these gentlemen propose to do in reference to the payment of these bonds?

When the ten-forties were issued, only a few months later, the newspapers declared, under authority of Jay Cooke, that they were the only bonds which principal was payable in gold, and that the declaration may offend the other.

It is said that those who purchased these bonds believed that they were to be paid in gold. I can not say, my friends, that they did not believe it, but I do aver that they had no reason to believe it. The law was open to their inspection, and was plain. They knew well that the Government of the United States paid every other debt that it owed, except only the interest upon the bonds, in legal-tender notes, and that the legal-tender notes were discharged every debt that they owed in legal-tender notes. They knew that they themselves, when they bought these bonds, paid for them in legal-tender notes, and that had no reason to believe that an exception would be made in their case.

It is said that if these bonds are payable in legal-tender notes at all, they must be paid out of the identical hundred and fifty millions issued under the act of 1862. The objection is too puerile for notice. It is said that these bonds are not payable in legal-tender notes, because the act of 1862 declared that the amount of legal-tender notes should never exceed four hundred millions, and this sum is not equal to the amount of the bonds. Indeed! Then, by like reasoning, they are not payable in gold, for all the gold in the country is not equal to one-fourth of the five twenties.

Now, gentlemen, I have thought it worth while to dwell thus in detail upon the legal and moral obligations of the Government to pay these bonds, and to show that it has no right to pay them in legal-tender notes, and to show that, in every argument by its out-riders, a repudiation is there. There is not a particle of repudiation in the proposition to pay these bonds in legal-tender notes, and to show the face of the bond, nor good morals, require that they should be paid in gold. [Cheers.] Repudiation! That is a charge which comes with an excellent grace from men who, in Ohio, and Indiana, and New York, and Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, paid in legal-tender notes the interest upon the State debt, which was contracted to be paid in gold. Repudiation! The charge is made by men who paid in depreciated paper, the United States debt, and who bought the notes for gold at par, and by the contract were to be paid in gold. Repudiation! The charge is made by the men who voted for the law which authorized every man who had agreed to pay a hundred dollars in gold to discharge it in legal-tender notes, and who are the repudiators, who, after they have compelled the people to take these legal-tender notes in payment of every public and private debt, in payment of every State, and county, and city debt, and who are the repudiators, who, after they are not declared by act of Congress to be, and not fit to be given to a public creditor. [Cheers.]

Do not misunderstand me here, I did not vote for that legal-tender act. I was in Congress at the time. I opposed it. I voted against it. I believed the policy was bad. We had no currency, and I believed we should maintain it, I thought the war might have been carried on, as the war was, by the issue of bonds, and those issued before the legal-tender act, were carried on for years, prior to the issue of the ten-forties, and without the issue of the ten-forties. I endeavored to the utmost of my feeble ability to enforce that policy upon Congress. I was overruled. It became a policy of repudiation. It became an incorporation into the business of the country, and I am now in favor, in good faith, of carrying it out to the end, until every advantage shall be realized, and until we can with safety and ease reverse this policy, as I believe we can, and return to specie payments in the country.

If these bonds may be lawfully and honorably paid in legal-tender notes, it is not good policy to do so. If a neighbor of yours, being largely indebted, should seek to secure his debts by bank notes issued in debts which do bear interest—if having contracted a debt for necessities when the price was very high, he should seek to pay it off when the price of everything he had to sell was very low, and especially if leaving the contract of the bank note, and the purpose deprecate the price at that time—what would you say of him?